



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

merely to tender an oath to the Epidaurians or to agree to accept an oath from them, the latter might rightly feel that they were getting very little satisfaction for the invasion and occupation of their territory. Assuming that some concession is required of the Argives we should look to the original dispute for a suggestion concerning the nature of the concession. It may be assumed as probable that the Epidaurians had for a time sent the victim in return for the privileges of pasturage that they enjoyed. Their discontinuance of the custom probably followed upon a curtailment of these privileges. Consequently the concession demanded of the Argives should be a recognition of the rights of the Epidaurians to a share of the sacred domain. It may seem daring to suggest that *ὅρκος* here means anything but *oath*, when *ὅμόσαι* follows so closely, but it is precisely *ὅμόσαι* that seems to rob *ὅρκον* of any meaning, and Stahl, it may be observed, finds one of the two words unnecessary. *ὅρκος* may also be used in the sense of Attic *ἔρκος* *fence, inclosure*. In proof of this we have in Hesychius *ὅρκοι· δεσμοί σφραγῖδος* (cf. *ἔρκος σφραγῖδος* Soph. *Tr.* 615); and the form *ὅρκ-* is also found in *ὅρκ-άνη, inclosure* (late *ἔρκ-άνη*) and *ὅρκμος· φράγμα*. The form *ὅρκ-* is of course to be expected in a noun formed with the *o*-suffix, while *ἔρκ-* is to be expected in an *ες*-stem such as *ἔρκος*. Reading, then, *ἐμεν λῆν* we may translate: *in the matter of the sacrifice of the god that the Argives consent to the Epidaurians having an inclosure, and that they (the Epidaurians) should swear to give it* (the sacrifice). *περὶ τοῦ σύμαρτος* is a mere introduction of the well-known subject of dispute. *ἐμελῆν* might be a corruption of *ἔξελῆν*, *that the Argives should set aside an inclosure*.

A. G. LAIRD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

#### AN INTERPRETATION OF LONGUS ii. 15

An episode in the second book of Longus' *Pastoralia* describes a visit of a party of Methymnaeans to the part of Lesbos where Daphnis and Chloe pasture their flocks. The Methymnaeans are wealthy young men enjoying a holiday. They man a boat with their own slaves, and coast around the island fishing and hunting (ii. 12). At one of their landings the painter of their boat is stolen by a rustic who needs it to repair his wine-press (ii. 13). At their next stopping-place, which is near the dwelling of the hero and heroine, the picnickers are forced to tie up their boat with an improvised cable of vines. Leaving the vessel, they go hunting among the hills. The barking of the dogs and the shouts of the hunters frighten Daphnis' goats, which run down from their hill-pasture and scatter along the shore. Finding scanty browsing there, they nibble in two the rope of vines and the boat floats out to sea with the receding surge. Returning to the shore, the Methymnaeans are enraged by their loss. Seeking the culprit goatherd, they find Daphnis, beat him, and try to

drag him away. His vigorous resistance is seconded by other goatherds, and finally all parties agree to submit the case to the arbitration of the old herdsman Philetas (ii. 15). The Methymnaeans, after setting forth their loss, close their statement of the case with this sentence (chap. 15, end): ἀνθ' ὅν ἀξιοῦμεν ἄγειν τοῦτον, πονηρὸν ὅντα αἰπόλον, ὃς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάττης νέμει τὰς αἴγας ὡς ναύτης.

This is the text adopted by Hirschig and Hercher. The Florentine manuscript, as reported by Seiler on p. 234 of his edition, has ὃς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἰδὼν νέμει τὰς αἴγας ὡς ναύτης. *ἰδὼν* has been variously emended, with little success—*ἴών* Courier, *ἀλίων* Jacobs, *φοιτῶν* suggested by Seiler. *ἴζων*, which has been suggested to me by a correspondent, cannot be reconciled with Longus' usage. The verb is very rare in prose, and Longus does not use it at all, though he has about thirty cases of other verbs meaning "sit." Hirschig and Hercher are probably right in omitting the word entirely.

But not all difficulties are removed by the rejection of the corrupt *ἰδὼν*. What has a sailor to do with tending goats, by the sea or elsewhere? Hinlopen, quoted by Seiler *loc. cit.*, recommended the excision of the words *ὡς ναύτης*. The passage has recently been emended by H. Richards (*Class. Rev.* XX, 1906, p. 21), whose brief note may be quoted in full: "It is difficult to make any sense of the last words. Read *ὡς ναύτην* and join it with *ἄγειν τοῦτον*. As he is a bad goatherd, they will take and make a sailor of him." This suggestion is at first sight attractive, but is open to objection. In the separation of *ὡς ναύτην* from *τοῦτον* there is an awkwardness that can hardly be paralleled in Longus' short and simple sentences. Seiler complained of even such an hyperbaton as is involved in Jacobs' conjecture *ὅς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀλίων νέμει τὰς αἴγας ὡς ναύτης*; "nimirum tum oporteret verba coniungi ita: *ὅς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀλίων ὡς ναύτης νέμει τὰς αἴγας*." Again, the Methymnaeans are not a press-gang of sailors, but well-to-do city-dwellers taking a short trip in a vessel which they have manned with their own servants (ii. 12). The clause *ὅδοιπόροι ἀντὶ ναυτῶν* (ii. 19) means, of course, only that they had to walk home instead of going by water. Finally, should it be suggested that *ὡς ναύτην* adds a desirable complement to *ἄγειν*, indicating the purpose of the abduction of Daphnis, it is sufficient to point to ii. 17, where *ἄγω* is used again with no explanatory phrase: *ἕπ' ὁργῆς ὄρμήσαντες ἥγον πάλιν τὸν Δάφνιν καὶ συνδεῖν ἥθελον*.

It has occurred to me that the explanation of the passage may be found in a play—not a brilliant one, it is true—upon a double meaning of the word *αἴξ*. Discussing the symbolism of goats in dreams, Artemidorus (ii. 12, p. 100. 18 ff. Hercher) says: *αἴγες . . . πάσαι πονηραί . . . μάλιστα τοῖς πλέοντι καὶ γὰρ τὰ μεγάλα κύματα ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ αἴγας λέγομεν*. For the etymological relations of *αἴξ*, "wave," it suffices to refer to Leo Meyer's *Handbuch* under the word. It is to be observed that Artemi-

dorus himself is not dealing in etymologies in the passage just quoted — his efforts in that line are usually awkward enough — but making a statement about the colloquial idiom, to which there is no reason for refusing credit. Hesychius has the gloss *αἴγες· τὰ κύματα. Δωριεῖς*. *Δωριεῖς* is suspected by Schmidt, with reason; but the word may at least indicate that the gloss is derived from some other source than Artemidorus. On the other hand, the glosses of Suidas (*s. vv. αἴγες, κύμα*) are evidently taken from Artemidorus. If, then, *αἴγες* was used colloquially in the sense of “waves,” “breakers,” the sense of the Longus passage would be: “He is a bad goatherd, who tends goats by the sea, like a sailor,” who may be said to tend the *αἴγες* on the sea, that is, watch the waves. The double meaning is somewhat heightened by an additional ambiguity in *ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάττης* — “by the seaside,” “on the shore,” or “on the high seas.”

PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS

CAMPBELL BONNER

## EMENDATION OF PLATO CHARMIDES 168b

The editions generally read φέρε δή· ἔστι μὲν αὐτῇ ἡ ἐπιστήμη τιὸς ἐπιστήμη, καὶ ἔχει τιὰ τοιαύτην δύναμιν ὥστε τιὸς εἶναι. ἦ γάρ; Jowett accordingly translates: “this science of which we were speaking is a science of something,” etc. The point is a slight one, but I think that it can be shown that the more probable reading is αὐτῇ ἡ ἐπιστήμη meaning “science (knowledge) in itself (in the abstract) is a relative term (is of something).”

The preceding paragraph has pointed out inductively that there is no desire except *of* pleasure, no love except *of* the beautiful, etc., and has raised the general question whether there can be any *ἐπιστήμη* which is not *of μαθήματος* but *of itself*. To answer this question Plato recurs to the nature of relative terms generally, and begins, as is his manner, at the beginning by demanding assent to the proposition that *ἐπιστήμη*, itself, as opposed to *μία τις ἐπιστήμη* (167c) is a relative term. It would be quite pointless and tautological to ask whether this supposed *τις ἐπιστήμη* which by hypothesis is *of itself* is *of something*. The argument runs rather: (1) *ἐπιστήμη per se* is a relative term. (2) But other relative terms seem always to be *of something else* not themselves. (3) Hence there is a presumption against *ἐπιστήμη* ever being *of itself*. The first example given is *τὸ μεῖζόν* (in general) *φαμεν τοιαύτην τιὰ ἔχειν δύναμιν ὥστε τιὸς εἶναι μεῖζον*. Only after this general statement is its specific correlate given, namely, *ἔλαττονός τιος*. So starting from the fact that *ἐπιστήμη per se* has some correlate we are to ask: is this correlate as in the other examples *something else* or by a strange exception *itself*? Cf. *αὐτῇ γε ἡ ἐπιθυμία*, etc., *Rep.* 437e, and *ἐπιστήμη μὲν αὐτὴ μαθήματος αὐτὸν ἐπιστήμη ἔστιν, ἢ ὅτον δὴ δεῖ θέναι τὴν ἐπιστήμην*. If I am right the error here as often arises from our failure to recognize the extreme minuteness of the dialectical links in Plato’s argument.

PAUL SHOREY